If we begin by asking the question, "How does it come about that *we* have developed so many different levels for categorizing weapons in our contemporary culture?" we see that the answer suggests two possibilites: increase in world anxiety and increase in importance of armaments. I would suggest, therefore, that what determines the variety of *social contexts* in which disease is discussed in Subanun is related to anxiety about disease and to its general cultural importance.

Finally, I would urge that Frake's beautiful analysis of locale, etc. on p. 127 is relevant to Husserl's "essences." Ideas like external, internal, balanced, piercing (or, better, penetration), spread (as contrasted with limited), visible, exposed, et cetera, represent generic classifications that might very well be inherent in human thought (as asserted by Husserl) and thus be present in *thinking* everywhere even though often not expressed in language.

JULES HENRY
Washington University

SOME COMMENTS ON WEINGROD'S ARTICLE ON RECIPROCAL CHANGE

Alex Weingrod's article, "Reciprocal Change: A Case Study of a Moroccan Immigrant Village in Israel" (1962:115–131), emphasizes a much neglected area in acculturation studies—that is, contact can and usually does affect both the so-called donors as well as the so-called receiving groups or borrowers. His forthrightness in positing the importance of reciprocal change is commendable. Further, he points out that prior scholars like Redfield, Linton, Herskovits, Kroeber, and Beals have agitated against the one way emphasis so prevalent in many culture contact studies. Weingrod's article exposes the mote in the eye of many who considered themselves objective students of culture change. However, in his journal article, I find that there are areas of disagreement between Weingrod's position and mine as well as areas lacking in clarity or in depth that, I believe, must be put right.

Early in his article, Weingrod (1962:116) states that in Morocco "Local and imperial Muslim rulers guaranteed the Jews life and property and also delegated internal community control to Jewish authorities." If we accept this flat statement about property guarantees, we are missing a unique opportunity to examine Hoebel's definition of property (1949:329) as a web of social relations . . . along a historical dimension and in two different culture contact contexts . . . namely, the Jewish-Muslim and the Jewish-French. Mouillefarine (1941:181), a French student of the legal maze that surrounded Moroccan Jews, investigated the complicated relationships between the Jew and property historically. Prior to 1912, he points out that the Jews did not have the right to own property outside of the *mellah* except in Tangier; they could rent buildings or ground but at their own risk since the *pasha* or proprietor could expel them at any moment without reason.

Before the 17th century, the Jews could acquire country houses and land to cultivate. However, life in the open country was always dangerous and it

lacked even the weak security of life in the city. There were a few Jews according to Mouillefarine who cultivated land with the help of their poor confreres. A declaration of June 25, 1668, prohibited the possession of immovable property by infidels outside of the *mellah* and ordered the Jews to sell their land to Muslim farmers (Mouillefarine 1941:182).

Ownership of property in the mellah was another story. The land of the mellah belonged to the Maghzen and did not belong to the Jews. The buildings which the Jews constructed belonged to them and they were legally able to sell the buildings (Mouillefarine 1941:176, 177).

After the French occupation, those few Jews who were protegés of France (Jacobs 1956:52) or who were made honorary citizens obtained and protected their property rights via the French courts and in spite of their Jewish origins and identification. For the majority, the possibility of outright and complete ownership of property was denied. It is obvious that Weingrod's statement that Muslims guaranteed the Jews their property is an oversimplification.

Weingrod errs, in my opinion, in stating that as long as the elder father was able to work, he controlled the household; with time and age, responsibility fell to the eldest son (1962:116, 117). My observations of Moroccan Jewish family life contradict limiting the father's power to his ability to work. Rather, I would make a strong case for the long enduring power and control that the Moroccan Jewish father exerted over his mature sons and daughters. In fact, there were cases where the *patriarch* had lived on far beyond his working years, and yet his control was felt and usually accepted by his married children who lived in their own homes as well as by those, married or single, who shared his board and roof.

Weingrod (1962:117) makes reference to the weakening of the Moroccan Jewish primary group and extended family. In my study, I found that the family structure (the primary group) was most stable and had survived 40 some years of culture contact with the French (Jacobs 1956:66). Weingrod's reference to the challenge to parental authority must be seen in the light of ambivalences that I found in my study. For example, the head of the family established somewhat of a dual code by allowing his children the advantages of the modern life outside of his home but insisting that the interior family life follow the time-honored customs, rituals, and practices. Certainly, conflict occurred to some extent (Jacobs 1956:57) but it follows Keesing's (1949:115) position that accommodations on the part of a group acculturating must be developed in order for people to get along with one another to ease the strains of contact. Here, double standards of conduct are frequently practiced; a certain complex of behavior or conduct is practiced for intra-group relationships while another complex is practiced for contact with the dominant (intruding) culture.

In a sense, therefore, Weingrod's observations of changes in social relations must be viewed as evidences of both the *external* accommodations that in essence act as a buffer for the maintenance of the traditional family structure and of the dynamics *within* the home. The son who had challenged his father and left

home, frequently returned to the fold when he married . . . often the wife chosen by his family . . . and would accept the obligations and responsibilities imposed upon him by his father, the conserver of the old culture.

I am at a loss to understand Weingrod's almost complete avoidance of religion, ritual, and folklore in his article. The total orthodoxy of Moroccan Jewry and their strong folklore beliefs and practices strike anyone who has observed or studied these people (Jacobs 1956:14–28, 61). Folklore beliefs and practices persist at least covertly to the present day (Jacobs 1956:61). It would have been enlightening to have examined these aspects of traditional Moroccan Jewish culture within the context of culture change in the Israeli village. Weingrod does peripherally and briefly mention that a rabbi lived in the village (1962:125). The importance of the rabbi, apparently the only one in this village, is given little weight by Weingrod's statement . . . "there was not . . . an eminent rabbi or other religious specialist among the settlers" (1962:121). I submit that if the population of Oren had but one rabbi, he would, for all intents and purposes, have been the eminent rabbi or religious specialist for that village. I have a growing curiosity about this rabbi who has been given such short shrift by the people of Oren. Why?

Another point that plagues me is Weingrod's obvious disdain for the fact that Moroccan Jewry had been involved in an acculturation process certainly since 1912 and perhaps earlier. Granted, he alludes to this fact in the very beginning of his discussion but pays little heed to its importance in his analysis. For example, he states that some of the younger members of Oren understood French. Now, the Alliance Israelite had established schools in most major cities and towns in Morocco. It is important to know where these Moroccan Jews had lived prior to reaching Israel. If they had lived in the cities or towns, I find it difficult to believe that the younger men only understood French. If they had lived in some remote village in the Atlas Mountains, it sounds more plausible . . . but this also means that they were outside the mainstream of acculturation that was evolving in the cities and towns where the majority of the Moroccan Jews lived. At the same time, it must be pointed out that within urban centers, French influence was more apparent with and was more readily absorbed by the upper and middle classes while the lower classes were least involved in the acculturation process.

It seems crucial that Weingrod identify the origins and class of the people of Oren. Both data are needed in order to know how to locate these Moroccan-Jewish immigrants on the traditional-transitional-modern continuum in the Moroccan context. How else can we isolate those changes that occurred in Israel from those that had already occurred in Morocco?

Precisely in line with the above, Weingrod mentions that the Moroccan Jewish settlers are accepting or learning from the Israelis "new ways of combating disease . . . (visit) the local infirmary, and (use) injections, pills, and hospitalization" in Oren. Again, this may be a completely meaningless conclusion unless the origins and backgrounds of the settlers are made explicit. In any event, physicians, hospitals, and medical treatment were not unknown

quantities in Morocco. In fact, a significant number of physicians, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses in the cities and towns were Moroccan Jews. Weingrod's attributing this to the Israeli-Moroccan Jewish contact in Oren may well be a spurious conclusion.

Weingrod's utilization of the fact that Oren settlers became farmers and used farm tools as proof that the settlers are adopting traits from the Israelis needs some clarification. First, it is important to point out that this is a directed or managed contact situation. Secondly, the point must be made that the settlers have no other choice or a set of alternatives that allows them to accept certain aspects of the culture or to reject certain aspects in this particular area.

On page 127, Weingrod states that the *moshav's* political structure has been altered in that, unlike the original moshavim, women at Oren never attend community meetings. This fact is consistent with the traditional MoroccanJewish practice that denies the woman a public role in religious life (Jacobs 1956:58) in a culture where public activity or organized activity operates under the unifying canopy of the religion. This is, however, a unique example of reciprocal change . . . Moroccan Jewish immigrants persistently hold on to a practice which brings about the reinterpretation of the moshav's political structure, an Israeli creation and institution. One might get the wrong impression that the reinterpretation is due to some dynamic change when, in actuality, it comes about because of a strong traditionalism of the Moroccan Jewish settlers.

MILTON JACOBS
American University

REFERENCES CITED

HOEBEL, E. ADAMSON
1949 Man in the primitive world. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

JACOBS, MILTON
1956 A study of culture change and stability: The Moroccan Jewess. Washington, The Catholic University Press.

KEESING, FELIX M.
1949 Cultural dynamics and administration. In Proceedings of the Seventh Pacific Science Congress. Auckland.

MOUILLEFARINE, EDOUARD
1941 Etude historique sur la condition juridique des Juifs au Maroc. Paris, Imprimerie Felix Carbonnel.

WEINGROD, ALEX
1962 Reciprocal change: A case study of a Moroccan immigrant village in Israel. American Anthropologist 64:115–131.

ON THE ORIGINS OF MODERN THEORETICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

In a forthcoming book, *In Search of the Primitive* (Basic Books), I attempt to interpret the history and role of anthropology in some detail; here, I simply wish to state that Stocking's article (AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST 65:783–99) on the dual significance, and nominal origin, of the concept of culture is per-